

# New Parliament Buildings.

---

The agitation for new Parliament buildings commenced in 1877. In 1880 the Commissioner of Public Works, Hon. O. F. Fraser, obtained from the Legislature a grant of \$500,000 towards the erection of the buildings. Plans and specifications on that basis of expenditure were then invited, but it was found that suitable accommodation could not be secured for that amount. In 1885 the Legislature set apart \$250,000 additional for that purpose. This sum was increased again during the session of 1887, making the total amount now set apart for the Parliament buildings \$1,050,000, for which, it is confidently expected, these buildings will be completed. The amount payable under the first contract awarded to the late Mr. York and since transferred to his bondsmen—Messrs. Carrol & Company—was for \$671,250; and in addition, 13,500,000 of Central Prison brick to be used in the construction of the new buildings.

A careful and detailed estimate by both the Departmental architect and the architect who prepared the plans, showed that the contract covered at least two-thirds of the work that would be required for the entire completion of the buildings. Other contracts were subsequently awarded to Mr. Yorke for carpentry work, etc., amounting to \$95,300. Under the present plans the cost will be greater than was contemplated when the first estimate of \$500,000 was asked from the Legislature, but the increase will be largely met by increased value that meanwhile has accrued to the lands which the Legislature set apart to be sold to recoup the Province for this expenditure. A parcel of land which was estimated by Hon. Mr. Fraser in his speech, in the House, at \$2,000 per acre, brought more than double that amount when placed in the market, namely \$4,100 per acre. It is safe to say, when the new buildings are completed, that these lands (which include the present site of the old buildings) will realize nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, so that the new buildings will not cost the Province, in cash, more than in the neighbourhood of three hundred thousand dollars. The architect of the new buildings is Mr. Waite, a

native of England, now a resident of Buffalo, one of the most eminent members of his profession on the American Continent. He was the architect of the Canada Life building, Hamilton ; the *Mail*, Toronto ; Bank of Commerce, Toronto ; and the magnificent structure now nearly completed for the Canada Life at Toronto. A comparison of the cost of public buildings in Canada and the United States with the Ontario Parliament buildings shows that the proposed expenditure is not excessive :

*State Buildings.*

Connecticut, at Hartford (population, 610,000) . . .	\$2,500,000
Illinois, at Springfield (population, 3,077,000) . . . . .	3,500,000
Iowa, at Des Moines (population 1,600,000) . . . . .	1,500,000
Michigan, at Lansing (population, 1,630,000) . . . . .	1,505,000
New York, at Albany (population, 5,082,000) . . . .	20,000,000

*City Buildings.*

Baltimore City Buildings (population, 332,000) . . .	\$3,000,000
Buffalo do do (population, 155,000) . . .	1,450,000
Pittsburgh do do (population, 156,000) . . .	1,000,000
Philadelphia City do (population, 850,000) . . .	7,000,000
St. Louis Court House (population, 350,000) . . .	1,200,000
Chicago City Hall and Court (population, 508,000) . .	4,000,000

*Public Buildings.*

Toronto, Asylum for the Insane . . . . .	450,000
do The Central Prison . . . . .	586,000
do City Hall and Court House (estimated), (population, 175,000) . . . . .	1,405,000
Quebec Provincial Buildings (population, 1,350,000)	1,393,783
Ontario Parliament Buildings, according to estimates by architects (population, 2,000,000) . . .	1,050,000
From which should be deducted the value of the lands set apart by the Legislature for that purpose, including the site of the old buildings, amounting to, at least \$700,- 000.	

The above estimate of the City Hall and Court House buildings does not include the cost of the site, and the present estimate of total expendi-

and said to be worth \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year.

they have claimed to be on the side of Catholic interests in the Senate.

ture, including the cost of site is \$1,600,000, all of which has been voted for and ratified by the people of Toronto.

The amount estimated for the Toronto buildings, including site, in September of 1884, by the committee having the matter in charge, was \$600,000. In 1887, the mayor, in his inaugural address, announced that the cost would not be less than \$750,000. In February of the same year, the building committee reported that the cost would not be less than \$1,020,000. And finally in 1889 the people of Toronto were asked to ratify and did ratify a total expenditure in respect of these proposed city buildings of \$1,600,000.

The final vote of the people of Toronto was in respect of a by-law for the issue of additional debentures amounting to \$600,000, and in respect of the voting on this by-law the *Toronto Empire* on 17th May, 1879, (amongst other things) said :

The building must be erected, and the only question is whether by cheese-paring parsimony we should have an edifice ill-adapted for its uses, unworthy of our city, and that with our continued growth would soon require additional expenditure more costly in the long run. or whether on the other hand we should erect city buildings which would be creditable to Toronto, and commensurate with its increasing population and important position.

Again in its issue of 14th May, 1889, the *Empire* said :

The by-law that will be submitted to the electors on Saturday to authorize debentures to the amount of \$600,000, to complete the sum required for the proposed Court House and City Hall has, of course, some critics amongst those who habitually object to any expenditure of money, even for a necessary purpose and as a measure of true economy. \* \* \* The citizens will be disposed to show their faith in the future of their city by constructing buildings commensurate with its position and its continued progress. \* \* \* The Queen City of Canada's foremost province would find it advantageous to have a City Hall and Court House suited to its important purposes and worthy of our position.

Electors of Ontario may well ask themselves why, if the City of Toronto is right in spending \$1,600,000 for its new city hall and court house, "Canada's foremost province" is not equally justified in an expenditure of hundreds of thousands dollars less in the erection of its Provincial Buildings.

The total cost of the construction of the Toronto City buildings (excluding the cost of site) will be \$1,405,000, and contracts have been entered into for all the works except that of plumbing and heating, which is estimated at \$80,000. The work covered by Mr. Yorke's contract for the Parliament buildings has been contracted for by the City of Toronto at the sum of \$838,000, or at an amount exceeding the contract price of Mr.

Yorke of \$86,000. It is therefore manifest that the Parliament buildings will cost far less than the Toronto buildings, and competent judges affirm that, when the site of the present old buildings is disposed of, the sum realized will make the entire actual expenditure of the province in respect of its new buildings, not to exceed \$250,000.

The opponents of the Government allege that Mr. Waite when employed to prepare plans for the building was not limited in the amount of their cost, but the following correspondence to be found in the Sessional Papers of 1887 will shew that he was in the strictest way limited to the amount of \$750,000, then voted by the Legislature:--

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,  
TORONTO, Janu ry 8th, 1886.

R. A. WAITE, Esq.,  
German Insurance Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

SIR,—Having reference to the consultation had with you this morning with respect to your being engaged to prepare plans, etc., for the new Provincial Parliament and Departmental buildings to be erected in this city, I herewith state briefly the terms and conditions upon which the Government will be willing to engage your services as architect in the preparing of these plans, etc., and for the usual architect's control and supervision of the work until fully completed.

1. The total cost of the buildings when fully completed is not to exceed the amount of \$750 000, set apart therefor by the Provincial Legislature, and within the limit of that expenditure ample provision and accommodation must be secured for the several departments, and their offices and vaults, the provincial library, the Legislative chamber, committee rooms, Speaker's and house officers' apartments, etc., as fully, in all respects, as is set forth and required by the printed general instructions issued by the Department of Public Works, in April, 1880, for the guidance of architects, then being asked to submit competitive designs for said buildings, and you will consider these general instructions as a guide in the preparation of plans, etc., by yourself.

2. The remuneration for your services (including all necessary and usual superintendence, etc., during the course of construction) to be at the usual rate of five per cent. calculated upon the total contract cost; such total contract cost not to include any sum or sums to which contractors may become entitled for any work commonly known as extras.

3. No extra work of any kind or character to be sanctioned or directed in connection with the construction of the buildings, except, and to the extent only, that the same has been first authorized in writing by the Commissioner of Public Works for the time being.

4. The Government to have the absolute and unrestricted right to reject any plans, etc., prepared or submitted.

(1) If, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works, the same are defective, faulty or unsuitable.

(2) If, in the opinion of the Commissioner, satisfactory contracts for the completion of the building within the contemplated costs are not, or cannot be secured, or entered into.

(3) And in any such case you are to have and be entitled to only such remuneration in respect of all services rendered, work done, loss of

and sold to be worth \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year.

they have claimed to be on the side of Catholic interests in the Senate.



time, etc., whether in respect of plans and specifications and their preparation or otherwise, however, as in the discretion of the Commissioner of Public Works may be fixed and allowed by him.

5. The plans (so far as necessary for submission to the Local Legislature) to be ready and delivered to the Department of Public Works not later than the 15th day of March next.

6. Plans and specifications to be sufficiently completed to admit of tenders for the works being advertised for not later than the 1st day of May next.

You will, at your very earliest convenience, please to notify the Department whether or not you will undertake the preparations of plans, etc., upon and subject to the terms and conditions above mentioned.

I remain, yours, etc.,

(Signed), C. F. FRASER  
Commissioner, etc.

BUFFALO, N.Y., January 20th, 1886.

HONOURABLE SIR,—I am in receipt of your favour of the 8th inst., embodying the terms and conditions upon which your Government offers to engage my services as Architect for the new Provincial Parliament and Departmental Buildings to be erected in Toronto. I have carefully noted the conditions and requirements named, and hereby accept them.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) RICHARD A. WAITE.

To the HON. C. F. FRASER,  
Commissioner of Public Works,  
Province of Ontario, Toronto, Ont.

And further, Mr. Waite's fees as architect being limited to five per cent. on a sum not to exceed \$750,000, he cannot, no matter what the buildings cost, be entitled to more than \$37,500 as fees. Up to the present time he has received only \$16,000, out of which he has had to pay his staff.

The charge against the Government that an absolute refusal was given to produce the reports of Mr. Waite and the departmental architect, Mr. Tully, with respect to the defects in the modified plans prepared by Messrs. Darling & Curry is not true, as the following extract from a departmental letter written to these gentlemen, and to which they have never replied, will show :—

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, ONTARIO,  
TORONTO, 26th April, 1887.

MESSRS. DARLING & CURRY,  
Architects, etc., Toronto.

SIRS,— \* \* \* \* The only matter which the Commissioner spoke of as being "confidential" was Mr. Waite's report on the plans, and the report of Mr. Tully, the chief architect of the department, confirming and

corroborating Mr. Waite's report, both of them agreeing that your plans were defective and unsuitable; and in this opinion the members of the Government, after a most careful and thorough consideration, have unanimously concurred. In this regard I am instructed to say, as has already been said to Messrs. Gordon & Helliwell, that if your firm desire the publication of reports by the expert and by the departmental architect upon the alleged defects in your plans, the Commissioner will take the necessary steps for their being produced to the Legislature and published in the usual way; but this will not be done unless at your express instance and request. \* \* \* \* \*

I am, gentlemen, etc.,

WM. EDWARDS,  
Secretary Public Works.

To the same effect was the statement made in the Legislative Assembly by the Commissioner of Public Works, on 10th March, 1887, during the debate on Mr. Creighton's motion for a return of the correspondence, reports, etc. Mr. Fraser as reported in the *Globe* of 11th of March, 1887, then said:—

"The report of Mr. Waite was, in the main, verbal, and was confidential. In this case, as in relation to the reports of 1880, the Government took the ground that no public service would be done by giving these reports. *If the architects interested desired it, the Government would bring down the information, but at the present time they were considered confidential.* \* \* \* \* \* The effort to obtain plans by competition having failed, what were the Government to do? They acted just as any business man would have acted about his private business. They chose an architect whom they considered competent and who had an intimate knowledge of the requirements of the Government. It was absolutely unfair to Mr. Waite to say that the opinion which he formed, and which resulted in the rejection of the plans, was reported to the Government on the assumption that he himself was to be appointed as the architect. He (Mr. Fraser) pledged his word of honor that it was impossible that Mr. Waite should suppose, from anything that took place, that his own services would be required. He had no reason to believe or suspect such a thing. Had the Government selected one of its own friends in Toronto it would have been at once charged that they had a political end in view. (Cheers.) They had chosen a gentleman with respect to whom that could not be said. They had taken the course that any business man would have taken and they expected that the country would sustain them in that course.

Moreover, Mr. Waite's plans were laid before the House in the session of 1836, before a contract of any kind was entered into or even tenders advertised for, and the following is reported in the *Globe* of 24th March, 1886, as the statement then made by the Commissioner of Public Works to the House in respect of these plans:

Hon. C. F. Fraser rose to make a statement regarding the new Parliament buildings. The House, he said, had consented to an expenditure of \$750,000, and he had made the statement that the intention was to adopt one of two sets of plans which had been sent in to the Government. After the House adjourned it was considered that, having reference to the important nature of the undertaking, a critical and close examination of the plans submitted by the architects

and said to be worth \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year.

they have claimed to be on the side of Catholic interests in the Senate.

plans were  
government,  
concurrent  
Messrs. Gor-  
ports by the  
acts in your  
ng produced  
not be done  
\* \* \*

should be again had. The gentlemen who had examined the plans sent in under the original competition were the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and two architects—Mr. Storm, of Toronto, and Mr. Waite, of Buffalo. The Government had decided that Mr. Waite should be selected to make this consultative examination for the Government and to advise the Government how far the plans would be suitable. On account of illness and other causes considerable delays took place and the result of Mr. Waite's enquiries was not known when he (the Commissioner) left for England last year. After his return from England he and the other members of the Government had several consultations with Mr. Waite, and the result of their consultations was that they became satisfied that none of the plans they submitted were suitable; that there were such grave defects in heating, lighting and ventilation that it would be inadvisable to proceed with building on the basis of either. The question arose, what was to be done? The Government had pledged itself to proceed with the buildings and they had come to the conclusion that their early construction was a necessity. They decided to secure the services of an architect and to have

#### A NEW SET OF PLANS

prepared. A careful deliberation as to who the architect should be resulted in the selection of Mr. Waite, of Buffalo. Mr. Waite had been twice employed as an expert in connection with the matter and it was thought that his ability and his position as an architect warranted the Government in selecting him. A letter of instructions sent to Mr. Waite and accepted by him embodied the agreement on which he was to prepare the plans. The cost of the buildings was not to exceed \$750,000 and within the limits of that expenditure accommodation must be secured for the several departments, offices and vaults, legislative chamber, committee rooms, Speaker's chamber, etc., as fully in all respects as set forth in the general instructions issued by the Department of Works in 1880, for the guidance of the architects. The architect's remuneration was to be had at the usual rate of five per cent upon the contract cost, such cost not to include sums which the contractors may be entitled to as extras. No extras to be allowed except to the extent authorized by the Commissioner of Public Works, for the Government has the right to reject any plans, first, if deemed unsuitable, or second, if it is considered that they cannot be constructed within the limit of expenditure above stated. In the event of the rejection of the plans, the architect's remuneration is to be fixed by the Commissioner. The plans were to be ready for inspection on March 15th, and the plans and specifications to be finished so as to admit of tenders being advertised for on May 1st. The architect of the Department fully concurred in the opinions of Mr. Waite as to the two sets of plans, and his conclusions were endorsed by the Department. The new plans with all details and specifications would be ready in three or four weeks, and provided these plans were approved, it was the intention of the Government immediately to advertise for tenders, and it was expected that in two or three months the contract would be let, and the work ready to proceed.

Hon. A. Morris asked how long it was expected that the erection of the buildings would occupy.

Hon. F. Fraser said that the building operations would be so extensive that not less than three years, perhaps four years, would be occupied. The floor plans for the new buildings, as also the floor plans of the former designs, were ready for inspection by the members.

In addition to the plans being so laid before the House, the contract entered into with Mr. Yorke, on the 7th of October of the same year, con-



tained an express stipulation that it was subject to its being ratified by a vote of the Legislative Assembly. The stipulation in the contract can be found in the Sessional Papers of 1887 and is in these words :

" It is hereby expressly agreed that this contract is made subject to the condition that the same shall be ratified by resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario at its next session : provided always that should the same be not so ratified, any work done or materials furnished under the said contract, by the contractor prior to said session shall, nevertheless, be paid for in accordance with the terms thereof.

The Legislature was, in the session of 1887, asked to ratify the contract with Mr. Yorke. The total amount of work done under this contract by Mr. Yorke, up to the 31st December, 1886, was less than \$7,000 and was entirely for work in connection with excavation for the proposed foundations and all of which would have been equally serviceable for any plans in respect of the new buildings which the house might prefer.

The following is the report contained in the *Globe* of 15th April, 1887, of the speech made by the Commissioner of Public Works in making the motion to ratify the contract with Mr. Yorke :

Hon. C. F. Fraser moved that this House doth ratify the contract and articles of agreement laid before this House by command of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, bearing date on the 7th day of October, A.D. 1886, expressed to be made between Lionel Yorke, of the City of Toronto, in the County of York, contractor, and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented therein by the Honorable the Commissioner of Public Works, and relating to the erection and construction of certain portions of the proposed new Parliament and Departmental buildings. He said that now that the House had an opportunity of perusing the contract and the papers it had ordered, and also the correspondence circulated by Messrs. Darling & Curry, he might ask the House to concur on this resolution. In 1880 it had been declared by Parliament that new buildings should be erected, and half a million dollars were set apart for that purpose. Pursuant to the understanding arrived at, designs were asked for and sixteen competitors entered the lists and submitted designs. That competition was in terms and in effect a failure, no one of the sixteen plans satisfying the requirements of the competition. Three of them was reported as

#### APPROACHING MOST NEARLY

to those requirements. It was then decided by the Government that the firm which had approached the standard most nearly, together with another firm, should be asked to submit modified designs, in order to see whether buildings could be erected within the appropriation which the House had made. The firms so selected were Darling & Curry and Gordon & Helliwell. In the early part of 1882 these modified designs were in such a shape as to warrant the architect in asking for tenders. Up to that time there had been no critical examination of these two modified designs, which were entirely different from the plans sent in by the same persons under competition. In the Darling and Curry correspondence reference was made to a report which they alleged was the report of the experts in connection with their designs, and they published a clipping from the *Globe* which they apparently wished the members of the House and the public

any and said to be worth 24,000 or \$5,000 a year.

they have claimed to be on the side of Catholic interests in the Senate.



to believe had been taken from the report sent in by the experts on their plans. Now, the only report sent in by the experts was one on certain plans which had come in under the name of "October," and the part of the expert's report referring to these plans spoke of them very highly and stated that it was a matter of regret that the authors of such plans had not taken into account the question of costs. Where the information was obtained from on which this article in the *Globe* to which he referred was based he was unable to say, but it appeared to him that the information contained in that article was most probably contributed by the competing firm itself, who not unnaturally wished to have stress laid upon the good and significant points in the plans they had set before the Government. The modified plans submitted by Messrs. Darling & Curry were

#### ALTOGETHER DIFFERENT

from those sent in by them at the time of the original competition. The original plans, according to the estimates of the experts appointed by the Government to consider them, would have cost the Province \$2,500,000. In the spring of 1881 they were in a position to ask for tenders upon the two modified sets of plans prepared respectively by Messrs. Darling & Curry and Messrs. Gordon & Helliwell. The House could readily see that the time had not come when a critical examination of these plans by experts would be of service or advantage. The government had promised the House that unless the plans could be proceeded with at the figure of \$500,000, or possibly a trifle over that amount, they would not be gone on with, therefore the first thing to be done was to ascertain if the tenders for the erection of the buildings on either of those plans would be within the figure named. It was found that the cost of erection based on the lowest tender, would be considerably over half a million and the matter, therefore, had to be suspended. The hon. gentleman quoted from reports in the *Globe* the substance of the remarks he had made in the House to show that he had publicly announced and had endeavored to make it thoroughly understood that in consequence of the impossibility of erecting the Parliament buildings for \$500,000 on the basis of either of the two plans he had named—the only ones before the Government—the matter of the erection would not be further proceeded with, and so far as the two competing firms were concerned, he held that the correspondence before the House showed that they had

#### THOROUGHLY UNDERSTOOD THE MATTER.

The hon. gentleman then read letters from the two firms named, asking the Department of Public Works to pay them the remuneration due according to the terms of the contract for the preparation of the plans. He denied that this remuneration had not been settled because of a difficulty on the part of the Government in dealing with the question. He himself had replied to the firms and had stated that the Parliament yet hoped that the matter of erecting the new Parliament buildings would be proceeded with, and that possibly one or other of the two sets of plans would be accepted by the Government, in which case, of course, the Department of Public Works would have to arrange the matter of compensation only with the firm whose plans were rejected. It would therefore be better to allow the question of remuneration to stand over for a while. He objected to any other construction than this being placed upon his words, and he wanted to set the matter clearly before the House and the public. In 1885, on the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton, the House decided by 50 yeas to 25 nays that the expenditure on the erection of new Parliament buildings could be carried as high as \$750,000. It was quite correct, as Messrs. Darling & Curry asserted in another of their letters, that at that time he stated that it was the intention of the Government to erect the buildings upon one or the

other of these plans. Tenders had been asked for, and the result had shown that the buildings could be erected within the requisite figure—\$750,000, and now came the time for the

#### EXAMINATION OF THESE PLANS

by an expert. Now what was the action of the Government in regard to this point? Was it not thoroughly businesslike and straightforward? The committee of experts appointed by the Government to examine the original plans had consisted of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Mr. Storm, of Toronto and Mr. Waite, of Buffalo. No complaint had been made by anybody as to the fairness and equity and ability of these gentlemen. It was natural, then, that when the Government wanted an expert to examine and decide upon the respective merits of these two sets of modified plans, they should determine to select one of three who had so well served them before. Mr. Mackenzie, not being a professional man, was out of the question. Mr. Storm was residing in the city of Toronto, and the Government naturally considered that objections would be raised to his appointment on the grounds of his being

#### LIABLE TO BE PREJUDICED.

There remained only Mr. Waite, of Buffalo. Mr. Waite was appointed as the expert to examine these plans, and no objection was raised to his appointment on the ground of lack of ability, impartiality or any reason whatever. He (the speaker) wanted to show the House step by step that the Government and the House had done what would seem fair and upright to any unbiassed and unprejudiced man. Well, Mr. Waite's decision as to the merits of the plans was—he repeated now what he had said before and would retract nothing—that they were both unsuitable and defective. Now he would not say that in consequence of the plans being found to be defective and unsuitable, the question of remuneration for the expenses in connection with the preparation of the same should be

#### ENTIRELY PUT ASIDE,

or that it was unfair for Messrs. Darling & Curry to say they had done their best in preparing them. He was not, he hoped, so blind or so prejudiced as that, although they had said harsh things about himself and others connected with him; and by the way, he thought that gentlemen who were so exceedingly anxious to protect their own reputation professionally, ought scarcely to insinuate in their correspondence that the Government had scarcely a shred of honesty, manliness or courage left amongst its members. They were very careful of their own reputations, but when dealing with the reputation of other people they did not hesitate to charge them with acting in a manner which they characterized as downright dishonest. He would not allow these facts to interfere with a fair and impartial consideration of the question before them. He ventured to say that if instead of finding both sets of plans

#### DEFECTIVE AND UNSUITABLE,

Mr. Waite had found those of Gordon & Helliwell unsuitable, and had been favorable to those of Darling & Curry, that Darling & Curry would not have made the complaints they were now making. He denied also, that he had ever stated that he had received no written report from Mr. Waite, as Messrs. Darling & Curry alleged he stated. He had stated that Mr. Waite's report was "mainly verbal." He had received a written report, and so stated at the time, adding that it was confidential. He had the report with him, and would read it. But this was not all. The plans were referred to the architect of the

department, and the Government had his report made in the month succeeding the report of Mr. Waite, and

#### FULLY CONFIRMING IT.

He had referred to the plans of Messrs. Darling & Curry as unsuitable, and he was bound to say that they were unsuitable in some respects as to which Messrs. Darling & Curry could not be blamed. Darling & Curry were dealing with an estimate of \$500,000, and had to do the best they could with that money. But at the subsequent period the Government had \$750,000 to deal with, and it became the imperative duty of the Government to do the best they could with that sum, and not to use these plans if it were found that they were unsuitable by reason of the fact that they were prepared on the basis of a cost of \$500,000. Up to this point the Government had done nothing but what a wise and prudent man would have done. This was not a great question of policy, nor of principle, as that word is ordinarily understood; it was purely a business matter, and the people of this country expected that the Government would deal with it on business considerations. And one of the first things to be considered was that the buildings, so far as they were concerned, were intended

#### TO LAST FOR ALL TIME.

If faulty, such buildings could very rarely be rectified. They had instances of faulty construction in the Parliament buildings at Ottawa and the costly State buildings at Albany. Again, as the matter was purely a business matter, it was the duty of the Government to see that the very best that could be done for the people should be done, irrespective of whether Darling & Curry, or Gordon & Hewell, or Mr. Waite, or Mr. Storm or anybody else should be satisfied. It would be utterly absurd to expect that when Mr. Waite had reported these plans as unsuitable and defective, when the members of the Government had come to the same conclusion, and when it was further ratified by the report of the architect of the department, it would have been absurd, nay, more, it would have been criminal on the part of the Government, in the face of these things, to have gone on with the erection of these buildings upon these plans. What, then, was the position? They had to face the fact that another set of plans would be necessary. Gentlemen opposite might contend that there should be a new competition. If they argued so, the answer was that the new competition would have ended as the original competition did. The former competition had failed; they had not obtained a single set of designs under it; they had had a second competition between two of the firms, and that had failed. They had also before them the fact that the City Council of Toronto had asked for plans for a new building.

#### AND THAT HAD FAILED.

So the experience of the Government pointed to the fact that competition was out of the question. There remained but one alternative—the selection of some architect competent to deal with the matter. It was suggested now that Mr. Waite's action with regard to these plans must have been influenced by the fact that he expected to have his own services retained. Mr. Waite made his report in November; subsequently the Government had interviews with him, and finally there was a report from the architect of the department. In all that there was not a single word from which Mr. Waite could have imagined that he would be retained. More than that, up to the time of these consultations, he could say for himself, and he believed he could say for his colleagues, that they had not only the hope, but the conviction, that one or other of these sets of plans would have been found suitable. Unwillingly, and against his own bias and prejudice, he was forced, and the Government was forced, to the conclu-

sion that it would not be possible to adopt these plans. How much time and trouble would he have saved himself could he have reached any other conclusion? They had no choice but to select some able, competent architect to prepare a new set of plans. If Mr. Waite had thought at all of the possibility of his being appointed, would he not have reasoned thus, 'This is a Government subject to political influences, to political exigencies—they will select

#### SOME POLITICAL FRIEND

of their own to prepare these plans. But that was not what the Government conceived to be their duty.' Their duty was clear, straight and plain—to choose the best man for the work, to give him his instructions and to let him go ahead. What other course would any gentleman opposite, any business man having \$750,000 of his own to expend, have pursued? Mr. Waite had acquired a reputation before the Government had any dealings with him. He had designed the *Mail* building, and although it had been twice visited by fire, it was Mr. Waite who was chosen to superintend the renewal on both occasions. He had been chosen by the experienced business men at the head of the Canada Life to design their fine building in Hamilton, and had also designed another large insurance building in Toronto. And now he had to announce for the first time that the Government had taken another measure of precaution. They had set upon foot confidential inquiries in places where Mr. Waite had already been employed in order that they might have the opinions of those he served as to his ability. After all that was done, Mr. Waite being out of the country and having no relations with the Government, they came to the conclusion that, in the interests of the people, he should be engaged. The instructions of the Government to Mr. Waite were before the House. The House should observe that in giving these instructions there was absolutely no attempt on the part of the architect to prepare inefficient plans that might be allowed to include a large number of extras. It would be quite possible for the architect to prepare to build on plans that might be within \$750,000, and by extras run the total cost up to a figure far in excess of that named, and in that case, if the percentage had been upon the whole amount of the contract price, there might have been, on the part of the architect, a tendency to be careless in the matter of extras. But the Government took care that no matter what the building might cost, the architect's commission should be no more than five per cent. on \$750,000. The Government had pledged itself to the Province that the building should be proceeded with, and he had expected that the year 1885 would have found them in a position to let the contracts. But the plans were not prepared until a later date than was expected, and it was not until the summer season of 1886 that the Government were in a position to call for tenders for the work. Before proceeding to the matter of tenders he would give the House an idea what the building would be, and how much more suitable it would be for the requirements of the Province than would have been a building erected according to the plans of Gordon & Helliwell or Darling & Curry.

In Darling & Curry's plans the legislative chamber was placed in the very centre of a quadrangle, and the consequence was that it would be difficult to light and ventilate. The great point of superiority in Mr. Waite's plan was that the chamber was the principal part of the whole building. It stood boldly out to the front, and three sides, the south, west and east were exposed, the consequence being that it was easy to light and to ventilate. The building would be about 400 feet in length by 200 feet in depth. The departments would all be on the easterly side of the building, and the offices connected with the Assembly on the western side. The main entrance would be on the southerly front, facing Queen street avenue. The building was practically arranged in



blocks, so that in case of a fire communication could be cut off. The building was not entirely fire proof, but the Crown Lands Department would be

#### PRACTICALLY FIRE-PROOF.

The dimensions of some of the rooms would be as follows :—Legislative chamber, 64x80 (the present chamber being 55x46); library, 46x72; members reception room, 29x40; dining-room, 29x40; smoking room, 30x41; Private Bills Committee-room, 29x40; Railway Committee-room, 25x40; and other committee-rooms varying from 20x40 to 18x22; reading-room, 28x56; post-office and distribution room, 24x40; reporters' rooms, 18x22 and 20x22. He had no hesitation in saying that the plans of Mr. Waite were far and away more suitable than either of the others. He now had to deal with

#### THE QUESTION OF COST.

When the tenders came in for the bricklaying and masonry it was found that the lowest tenders exceeded the amount voted by Parliament for the entire building. The contractor had been asked to tender for Credit Valley stone, and it was thought that this might account for the high figure the tender reached. So Mr. Lionel Yorke and Messrs. Brown & Love, who were by far the lowest tenderers, were asked to make new tenders, based upon three different qualities of stone, Ohio sandstone, Pelee Island stone and Queenston stone. Brown & Love's original tender for Credit Valley stone had been \$772,700. They made a tender on Ohio sandstones of \$698,700 and on Pelee Island stone for the same amount. Lionel Yorke's original tender had been \$809,000. Both firms afterwards sent in reduced tenders on Credit Valley stone, Brown & Love's being \$736,000 and Lionel Yorke's \$752,000. It was then considered that so small was the difference between the tenders for Credit Valley stone and the tenders for the other varieties, and so great was the superiority of the Credit Valley stone, that it was best to choose the Credit Valley stone. Then the Government were face to face with the fact that the masonry and brickwork were going to cost more than the amount which the Legislature had set apart for the entire building. What were they to do? The Opposition might say that they should

#### HAVE STAYED THEIR HANDS,

although the buildings were necessary, although the country had been promised that the buildings would be erected. He would answer that in two ways. In the first place the contract made by the Government had been made subject to ratification by the House and in the second place he maintained that the Government would have been justified in making such a contract, even though it were not to be subject to such ratification. Finally the people of the country

#### HAD RATIFIED THE ACTION

of the Government. (Applause). The question had been put before the people and the answer of the people was the majority which stood behind the Government in this House. (Applause). The Opposition had made the question an issue. They told the people to defeat the Government because they had entered into an undertaking which would cost two million dollars. He had in his hand a campaign sheet headed "Facts for the electors. The Parliament Buildings. Canadian architects ignored. Contracts for walls alone \$50,000 more than the whole building was to cost. Condemn the swindle." He observed that his friend from North Grey winked. (Laughter.) The document proceeded :—"The conduct of the Ontario Government in connection with the buildings now about to be erected in Toronto displays

#### THE MOST RECKLESS CHAPTER

in the history of any Government the Province has ever known." (Laughter.) The circular called upon the people "to condemn the swindle on the people of

the Province which the Government is now perpetrating." These were brave words—(laughter)—especially when it was remembered that nothing was being done that was not open to the public. Mr. Fraser continued to read from the circular amid the laughter of the House, and then produced an article from the *Owen Sound Times*, which, he said, was word for word the same as the campaign sheet, except that the *Times* article contained a very strong denunciation of the entire Toronto press for concealing the amount of the Yorke contract. He would not say for a moment that the two articles were penned by the same hand. (Laughter.) No doubt their similarity was a coincidence amounting almost to a miracle. (Laughter.) But he thought he had

#### TRACED HOME ONE CAMPAIGN

sheet fairly, and he did not know but he could trace home a few more. (Laughter.) But enough for to-day—sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.

MR. CREIGHTON—Is that an evil?

MR. FRASER—Such were the appeals which had been made, and the people had answered them by sending back the Government with a largely increased majority. Now, as to the cost of the buildings, they were not going to cost two millions, as had been stated. He held that the amount that would have to be paid for work done that was not named in the tender would not exceed the same figure that Messrs Darling & Curry had estimated as being additional to the amount they named for the erection of the buildings. That figure was \$306,000, and he believed that \$300,000, on the basis of the present plans would cover the same work, viz., all work not actually included in the contract, in spite of Messrs Gordon & Helliwell's statement that it would cost as much as the actual cost of the buildings. The hon. speaker said there was little more that he could say at the present time, but he might have occasion to say more during the course of the debate. He referred briefly to the

#### TERMS OF THE CONTRACT,

showing that the public were carefully guarded against the placing of any extras in the contractor's bill, and said the Government would use every means in its power to prevent such extras creeping into the charges. Reverting again to Messrs. Darling & Curry's claim for remuneration, Mr. Fraser urged that their claims for \$15,000 was exorbitant, and that the services of the best architect on the Continent could have been secured for that figure. These young men in fact, he said, were asking

#### FOR SIX MONTHS' WORK,

as much pay as the Attorney-General received in three years for devoting his whole time and attention to the affairs of the Province. The other competing firm, Messrs. Gordon & Helliwell, moreover, had only asked for \$5,000 for similar plans made under similar conditions, and had been satisfied by receiving \$3,700. He claimed that in resisting Messrs. Darling & Curry's claims he had been defending the best interests of the Province. The House, in ratifying this contract, would also express its approval of the action of the department here presented in regard to this transaction. (Applause.)

Attempts are now being made by opponents of the Government to belittle Mr. Waite's plans, and to make it appear that the plans of Darling & Curry were greatly superior. But the *Toronto World*, on 3rd May, 1888, in an article urging that iron instead of timber should be used in the new building, said:

We are convinced that the Province is making a great mistake in using wood in the new Parliament Buildings in the Park. A pile that promises to be the

finest in appearance of any on the continent, that appears to be built on the plan of getting one hundred cents worth of work on the dollar, that ought to be a monument for centuries, is to be marred at its inception by the use of timber instead of iron.—*The World*, 3rd May, 1888.

And again, on 11th August, 1888, in an article descriptive of the character and progress of these buildings, the *Toronto World* contained the following:—

#### HOW THE WORK IS PROGRESSING AT THE GRAND STRUCTURE IN THE PARK.

In close proximity to Toronto's University and its subsidiary institutions, the new Legislative Building is being upreared. This massive and imposing structure, stretching east and west 550 feet and extending 250 feet to the rear of the front tower, is now advanced to such a stage that some idea of its beauty and symmetry can be formed. The style of architecture is Romanesque. It is eminently simple and striking in detail. Mr. R. A. Waite, Architect, of Buffalo, prepared the plans and designs for the building.

The front elevation contains the main entrance which consists of a tripple archway. In the centre square tower rises, surmounted by four domed turrets, one at each corner of the quadrangle. The south-west front is richly ornamented by exquisite yet massive dressed stone work. The west elevation will contain two entrances, one of which, the Speaker's, is open to the north side, along which finical columns of different design are arranged. The eastern elevation is similar, though somewhat less gorgeous.—*The World*, 11th August, 1888.

And the *Toronto Empire*, on 27th September, 1889, in an article headed "The Big Pile slowly rises," when no election was pending, and when not tempted to publish other than the truth, said as follows:—

#### THE BIG PILE SLOWLY RISES.

##### MAGNITUDE OF THE WORK.

The average onlooker who, standing by, watches stone after stone hoisted into position has no conception at all of the magnitude of the work in hand. The building covers no less than four acres of ground, and the massive stone walls, lined with brick, are, in some parts, six feet in thickness. The building is evidently being put up to stand, no matter what the ultimate cost might be. The main entrance, the entrance to the legislative chamber from the south, will be something handsome in its massiveness. The smoothly cut stone steps will not be built in all probability until after the whole building is roofed, because the required blocks cannot be got. This main entrance is in a line looking down Queen street avenue, and when completed the

##### EFFECT WILL BE SOMETHING FINE.

In its present incomplete state, however, it would be useless to attempt a description of the great building. A feature of the structure, however, will be the amount of stone carving exhibited on all sides. The carving on the front of the building to the south will be of the most elaborate character, while grotesque, but artistic figures will stand on each side of each of the departmental entrances. There are many panels on the walls which will carry figures and scroll work carved in the solid stone. The building will, no doubt, when completed be the finest structure in Toronto, but, of course, it is impossible at this stage to give any idea of the cost.

The *Toronto Telegram*, which is an independent Conservative journal, speaks of the Government's dealings with the new Parliament buildings in these words :—

"Hon. C. F. Fraser is fortified against effective attacks upon his dealings with the question of erecting new Parliament buildings. The Government supported an outlay that is barely sufficient to satisfy the requirement and keep up the dignity of the Province. The Minister of Public Works is seeing that the Province gets value for every cent it spends. The country is not being cheated and when the Opposition cannot boldly impute wrong to the Hon. Mr. Fraser it is unfair to declaim against an expenditure that was wholly unavoidable. As to the architect, the Government acted upon its judgment of what was right. Political interest would have dictated the choice of a native Canadian to originate and execute designs for the new legislative building. The Government puts aside every consideration but that of fitness, and did not allow the unpopularity of its course to deter it from doing what was right."

And again in a subsequent issue as follows :—

Of all the small-sized issues ever imported into Ontario politics the complaint about the Ontario Government's dealings with the Parliament buildings is the smallest.

There is absolutely nothing in it. From beginning to end the Government has acted in the best interests of the country. It would have been easy for it to employ a Canadian architect and excuse his mistakes by appeals to a spurious patriotism. The Government could gain no political glory by its action. It served the province in this particular at the expense of party interest, and time will declare praise, not censure, to be the just portion of the men charged with responsibility of the erection of the new legislative block.

And finally, though the expenditure to the close of 1889 in respect of these buildings has been about half a million of dollars, not one dollar of actual "extras" has been incurred or made with respect to the work already done.